Inclusive language:  
  
The main purpose of Paul Keating’s speech, along with paying homage and respect to Australian soldiers who lost their lives in wars, is to unite the nation and emphasise the importance of the ANZAC legend. Keating’s use of inclusive language throughout the speech is an ideal means of achieving this end. **I like this**  
  
Keating begins with an inclusive pronoun in “we do not know” to set the tone for the rest of the speech. Anaphoric repetition in “we do not know” is used to emphasise the anonymity of the Unknown Soldier and highlight that the anonymity makes him representative of every Australian. Already, this inclusive tone has the effect of establishing a unifying connection between him and the audience.  
  
A truncated inclusive sentence is used by Keating “And he is one of us” to highlight that the Unknown Soldier is Australian, he is part of the ANZAC legacy. **To me, the rest of this paragraph is getting away from inclusive and moving into general word choice material**After using emotive language to condemn the war and its instigators in “political incompetence” and “waste of human life”, he invites the audience to consider the significance of the Unknown Soldier in the light of the costs of war. He returns to using personal inclusive pronouns in “our war dead...this is not true” to assert they did not die in vain. Keating declares that the legacy of the Unknown Soldier has taught Australians to collectively learn the importance of courage, resilience and self-belief. He attempts to unite the Australian people under the ANZAC legend, by listing highly emotive qualities such as “triumph against the odds”, courage, “ingenuity in adversity”, “mateship” that comprise the “democratic tradition” of the nation.   
  
He uses contradiction and inclusive language in “what we have lost and what we have gained” to portray that the tomb of the Unknown Soldier is symbolic of the sacrifices made by the soldiers and to unite the nation in remembering and paying respect to Australia’s “war dead”. **This next bit also general word choice.**His use of colloquialisms in “bonds of mateship” and “stick together” also successfully creates a sense of unity and enables him to get his message across more effectively to the audience. Thus his use of inclusive language is successful in getting his message across.

**I’d try and link the use of inclusive language to the structure of the speech – get the audience connected in opening paragraphs – you do deal with these but you could be more thorough. Emphasis then changes to more 3rd person point of view about the Unknown Soldier – sure, there are some personal, inclusive references scattered which you mention. But then at the end Keating switches back to 1st person, inclusive at the end (the previous 3 paragraphs had all started with the UAS). Wants to reconnect again with audience – why? What’s his point? I think you could really develop why Keating uses this language to start and end his speech.**  
  
  
Lasting effect:  
  
Paul Keating’s speech reflects several ideals and beliefs that have a lasting effect on the audience. It has an enduring value that transcends the one time and place when the speech was made.   
  
In his speech, Keating creates a sense of national identity through the Unknown Soldier by listing his qualities which “taught us” to “endure hardship, show courage, be bold as well as resilient”. According to him, this leads to a “deeper understanding of what it means to be Australian.” He successfully unites the audience under the legend of the ANZAC and highlights that it is their legacy that moulds the Australian character. Ideals such as “triumphs against the odds”, “courage”, ingenuity in adversity” and “bonds of mateship” are embodied by the Unknown Soldier, and it is to him that real “nobility and grandeur” belong. His portrayal of national identity and “democratic tradition” resonate even today as values such as mateship, loyalty, courage and a never-say-die attitude are held in high esteem by Australian society. **This is good. As I think I said, avoid double-using quotes-techniques**  
  
Throughout the speech, Keating also highlights his negative attitude towards war, with emotive words such as “awful, mad, and brutal” and condemns the “political incompetence” that gives rise to conflict. Spiritual allusions in “enshrine a nation’s love for peace...sacrifice of men” highlight the lesson which transcends the costs of war. On the other hand, the validity of that conclusion can be questioned in today’s context seeing the number of wars Australia has been involved in since then. **You could argue this was a subtext in the speech. The occasion required a lyrical formal memorial but perhaps Keating wanted to comment about far-away ways that do not really concern Australia. Just a thought – if you don’t see it, leave it.**  
  
Another enduring ideal from the speech is the capability of “ordinary” people to be heroes which Keating emphasises in the paradoxical lesson “about ordinary people...they were not ordinary”. This in particular resonates with today’s audience since it is an inspiring, motivational ideal – that every person has in them what it takes to be a hero. **Good – could make a bit more of this**  
  
Thus Keating’s speech, and the ideals and values in it have a lasting effect on Australian society.  
  
  
Similarities:  
  
The themes – justice, identity, both call for remembrance, calls for unity.  
  
Differences: Bandler more colloquial, anecdotal, personal. More confrontational, calls for action rather than just remembrance. **Yeah, I reckon this is good. I was surprised on close reading how much Bandler sticks it to the whites. There is a lot of conciliatory tones but she does not step back from taking them on. Not inflammatory or provocative, but insistent nonetheless.**  
  
I plan to expand on those ideas....and will write more about Bandler in this one. Does that sound all right? Also, how should you start and conclude the first three 5 mark answers? Essay style or just one introductory and concluding statement? **I’m not sure here. I like the unfolding structure of the ideas as a skeleton for the response. It’s getting late and you should be abed soon. But – don’t repeat anything. The tricky part I see is dividing your evidence between word choice and enduring appeal. Some double-up might be unavoidable but be careful. Mr Thornton is marking this and double using evidence is something he is watchful about. I have to retire. Best wishes Malhar. Mr w**